

Serial No.: 09/882,597
Group Art Unit 2157
Page 5

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Office action mailed August 12, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response claims 1-9, 16, and 20-29 are pending. More specifically, claim 1 is amended and claims 21-29 are added. This amendment and these added claims are specifically described hereinafter.

I. Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Horvitz, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130) in view of *Bates, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,732). Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Horvitz et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130) in view of *Bates et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,732) and further in view of *Shaw et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,341). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Sall spent with Applicants' Attorneys Jeff Kuester and Benjie Balser during a September 14, 2005, telephone discussion regarding the above-identified Office Action. Applicants believe that various features described in the patent application and recited in the claims, including unconditionally deleting all attachments were discussed during the telephone discussion, and that the outcome of this discussion is addressed herein. During that conversation, Examiner Sall seemed to indicate that it would be potentially beneficial for Applicants to file this amendment and response. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Sall carefully consider this amendment and response.

Serial No.: 09/882,597
Group Art Unit 2157
Page 6

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 1-9, 16, and 20

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Horvitz, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130) in view of *Bates, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,732). Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Horvitz* and *Bates* in view of *Shaw et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,341). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites:

1. A method of manipulating email messages with an email network appliance comprising:
receiving an email message, the email message having had all attachments automatically unconditionally deleted such that the email message is text only;
classifying the text only email message;
inserting the text only email message into a classification container; and
presenting the classification container in a classification display section.
(Emphasis Added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981). Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of *Horvitz* and *Bates* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **receiving an email message, the email message having had all attachments automatically unconditionally deleted such that the email message is text only.**

The Office Action alleges that "Bates discloses receiving an e-mail message with attachment, and the attachment is deleted, and the e-mail message without the attachment is sent to the web client." See Office Action, page 4. However, in *Bates*, a virus check is performed

Serial No.: 09/882,597
Group Art Unit 2157
Page 7

and an attachment is removed from the e-mail only under the condition that a virus is detected. In the system of Bates, if a virus is not detected, the attachment is not deleted. Bates does not disclose having had all attachments automatically unconditionally deleted. Horvitz does not cure this deficiency.

As shown above, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all the elements of claim 1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the analysis hereinabove, there are other reasons why claim 1 is allowable.

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2-9, 16, and 20 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-9, 16, and 20 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 1. See *Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002) *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 54 U.S.P.Q.2d 1086 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, the rejection to claims 2-9, 16, and 20 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-9, 16, and 20 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 2-9, 16 and 20 are allowable.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claims 1-9, 16, and 20, *Shaw* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Horvitz* and *Bates* noted above. Therefore, claims 1-9, 16, and 20 are considered patentable over any combination of these documents.

Serial No.: 09/882,597
Group Art Unit 2157
Page 8

IV. Newly Added Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that cited references fail to teach or suggest all features of newly added claims 21-29. Specifically, claim 21 is allowable over *Horvitz* and *Bates* for at least the reason that they fail to teach "deleting all attachments for all email messages received for a user." Claims 22-29 are dependent claims that incorporate the limitations of independent claim 21, the allowability of which is set forth above. Therefore, claims 21-29 are allowable over any cited reference.

V. Miscellaneous Issues


Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

Serial No.: 09/882,597
Group Art Unit 2157
Page 9

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendment and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-9, 16, and 20-29 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey R. Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

Customer No.: 38823